

MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
CENSUS SURVEY OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE (CSOS)
AND THE
POPULATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (POPTAC)

April 4, 2006
MAG Office, Suite 200, Cholla Room
302 North 1st Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

CSOS MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman	Sonny Culbreth, Litchfield Park
Pier Simeri, Avondale	Scott Butler for Jim Huling, Mesa
Brian Rose, Buckeye	*Matt Holm, Maricopa County
Gary Neiss, Carefree	Karen Flores, Peoria
*Ian Cordwell, Cave Creek	Tom Remes, Phoenix
**David Bigos, Chandler	Mark Young, Queen Creek
Joanne Garrett, El Mirage	Bridget Schwartz-Manock, Scottsdale
*Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills	Stephanie Wilson, Surprise
***Paula Loper, Gila Bend	**Sherri Lesser, Tempe
Brent Stoddard, Glendale	*Miles Johnson, Wickenburg
**Jerene Watson, Goodyear	*Mark Fooks, Youngtown
**Gail Acosta, Guadalupe	* Richard Bohan, Maricopa County

* Not in attendance ** Participated via audio conference ***Participated via video conference

POPTAC MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

George Pettit, Gilbert	Karen Flores, Peoria
*Scott Wilken, Avondale	Tom Remes, Phoenix
Brian Rose, Buckeye	Shawny Ekadis, Queen Creek
David De La Torre, Chandler	Stacy Gubser, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Gary Neiss, Carefree	Indian Community
*Ian Cordwell, Cave Creek	Harry Higgins, Scottsdale
Ken Valverde, Fountain Hills	Janice See, Surprise
*Terry Yergan, Gila River Indian Community	**Sherri Lesser, Tempe
**Paula Loper, Gila Bend	*Chris Hagen, Tolleson
Kate Langford, Glendale,	*Miles Johnson, Wickenburg
Katie Coble, Goodyear	*Mark Fooks, Youngtown
Wahid Alam, Mesa	*Ann McCracken, RPTA
Duncan Miller, Paradise Valley	*Matt Holm, Maricopa County

1. Call to Order

George Pettit, Chair of both the Census Survey Oversight Subcommittee (CSOS) and the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC) called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Roll call was taken for CSOS and POPTAC.

2. Call to the Audience

There were no requests to address the audience.

3. Preliminary Results from the 2005 Census Survey

Rita Walton provided background on the 2005 Census Survey and reviewed the U.S. Census Bureau survey process and issues associated with the preliminary Census Survey results.

She noted that the overall Maricopa County vacancy rate had increased from 9.2 percent in Census 2000 to 12.5 percent reported in the preliminary results from the 2005 Census Survey. Ms. Walton indicated that the Census Bureau vacancy rate includes unoccupied units as well as housing units occupied by seasonal residents. Ms. Walton stated that the Census Bureau plans to resurvey a sample of housing units for valid responses such as obtaining a more accurate vacancy rate.

George Pettit asked whether the Census Bureau would be resurveying all vacant units. Rita Walton responded that the Census Bureau plans to resurvey a sample of all vacant units. She added that the resurvey of vacant units may cause a jurisdiction's population to increase from its preliminary 2005 population number.

Karen Flores asked if the Census Bureau will use the September 1st date when resurveying the vacant housing units. Rita Walton responded yes they will use the September 1, 2005 reference date.

Lenore Lancaster asked when the Census Bureau will begin to resurvey vacant housing units. Ms. Walton estimated that the Census Bureau would begin field work April 20, 2006.

Harry Higgins asked if the Census Bureau would supply data on the location of the vacant units. Rita Walton responded that due to confidentiality restrictions the Census Bureau will not.

Rita Walton asked for additional ideas on supplying documentation to the Census Bureau regarding vacancy rates.

Lenore Lancaster suggested looking at voter registration files. She said that Paradise Valley had an increase in voters according to their voter registration files and that was inconsistent with the Census Survey which showed a reduction in population.

Sam Andreas asked about using Post Office records to determine when a seasonal resident left their Maricopa County residence in 2005. Rita Walton responded that MAG staff will follow-up with the Post Office but suggested that jurisdictions interested in obtaining information from the Post Office should also work with them directly.

Other documentation suggested included water consumption and phone hook-ups.

Wahid Alam asked how the resurvey of vacant housing units would be any different from the last time they were surveyed. Rita Walton said that the Census Bureau would be enhancing the training of census workers and creating flash cards so that the worker fully understands the question and can help respondents complete the questionnaire accurately.

Rita Walton said that jurisdictions that provided address lists could send any additional addresses to the Bureau that were not included on their original address file.

Sonny Culbreth asked whether a city that did not submit an address list could now provide them. Rita Walton responded that it would be beneficial to supply addresses if available.

Gail Acosta asked whether the Census Bureau would be doing the resurvey by phone or in-person. Rita Walton responded that the resurvey of vacant units would be conducted via personal visit.

Karen Flores asked if the issues for each community would be addressed prior to the final numbers being released. Ms. Walton indicated that would be a question to ask the Census Bureau.

Ms. Walton noted that the deadline for submitting appeals for population in group quarters had passed and that three jurisdictions: Phoenix, Fountain Hills and Litchfield Park had submitted group quarter appeal letters.

Duncan Miller asked if the information provided by school districts on enrollment might be helpful in supporting higher population levels. Sonny Culbreth commented that school enrollment figures for Litchfield Park include students who live outside of Litchfield Park.

Lenore Lancaster asked what would happen if only 900 of the 1000 housing units provided by the city or town were found in the Survey. Rita Walton provided an example where a town had 10,000 housing units, 1,000 housing units were in sample, and 900 housing units were actual residences. She said the Census Bureau would apply the 10% to the 10,000 total housing units and the vacancy rate and persons per household would be calculated based on the 900 residential housing units.

Shawny Ekadis asked for clarification on how sample blocks were address canvassed. Rita Walton explained address canvassing and mentioned that MAG can send the sample blocks to any member agency that requests them. Rita Walton stated that if a jurisdiction believed that the blocks chosen for the survey were not representative of the entire jurisdiction, they may want to include that point in their letter to the Census Bureau with supporting documentation.

Sonny Culbreth asked how the Census Bureau determined the sample size for each jurisdiction. Rita Walton explained that sample size was a function of number of housing units, persons per household and vacancy rate for a jurisdiction. She noted that for smaller cities a higher percentage of their housing units needed to be sampled to achieve an 95 percent confidence interval plus or minus 2 percent.

Wahid Alam noted that Mesa's 2005 housing units were lower than the Census 2000 housing units in one of its subareas. He questioned how this could take place in an area where growth had occurred and

there were few demolitions. Rita Walton suggested that Mesa send the Census Bureau addresses that had not been previously submitted as a part of its address list.

David de la Torre asked whether a map showing block groups was used by the Census Bureau to select Chandler's sample. Rita Walton responded that the Census Bureau took the sample directly from the address list provided by Chandler.

Rita Walton suggested that anyone who had a concern about their preliminary census estimate send a letter with any associated documentation to the Census Bureau expressing those concerns.

Rita Walton said that there would be additional costs associated with extra work being undertaken by the Census Bureau, but that there is money remaining from the Census Survey funds which can be used to cover the additional costs.

David Fitzhugh asked whether there was a final date by which the Census Survey results needed to be provided. Rita Walton said that the deadline for submitting letters and information to the Census Bureau was April 14, 2006, but the Census Bureau would like the information as soon as possible. She also noted that it appears that the Department of Revenue (DOR) would accept Census Survey results after May 1, 2006.

Karen Flores asked how a jurisdiction's state-shared revenue would be impacted if their preliminary number became their final number. Rita Walton responded that for the distribution of most of the state-shared revenues each jurisdiction's funds are based upon its share of the population of all the other cities and towns in the state. So it isn't just a question of one jurisdiction's population figure, but its relationship to everyone else's population.

Rita Walton urged member agencies to keep MAG staff informed on their housing unit survey review. She requested that MAG be copied on letters sent to the Census Bureau.

Karen Flores asked if there was a specific format that needed to be followed when writing a letter to the Census Bureau. Rita Walton responded that the guidelines for submission were included in Attachment One to the agenda.

Rita Walton noted that an example of good documentation is Mesa sending the Census Bureau aerial photos which identify housing units that had been omitted from the city's original address list. She said the date of the aerial photography is May 2005.

David de la Torre asked when and how the Census Bureau would reply to the housing unit survey review letter and supporting documentation. Rita Walton said that she did not know how the Census Bureau would respond to the letters.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

